

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7 and 11-23 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is independent and has been amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found in the specification, e.g., at page 4, line 30 to page 5, line 19, Figures 1 and 2, and Examples 1 and 2, as originally filed. The specification has been amended for minor editorial purposes, in accordance with the Office's suggestion. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, including the Examples, as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, entry of all of the amendments is kindly requested.

Applicant wishes to thank the Office for indicating that the pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art of record. Applicant agrees that the cited prior art of record does not describe or suggest the claimed invention. Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is requested in view of the remarks below.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is traversed and obviated by amendment.

In particular, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the steps for purifying and separating of the crude IPDA, in accordance with the Office's suggestions. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite that the "purifying and separating" of the crude IPDA are performed/accomplished by the following steps: "by distillation or by crystallization."

As the Office is aware, [w]hen analyzing the enabled scope of a claim, . . . claims are to be given their broadest and reasonable interpretation that is consistent with the specification." MPEP § 2164.08. (Emphasis added). Moreover, when "determining whether an unclaimed feature is critical, the entire disclosure must be considered. Features which are merely preferred are not to be considered critical." MPEP § 2164.08(c). (Emphasis added).

As described in the present specification on page 4, line 30 to page 5, line 19, cis- and trans-isomers of IPDA have boiling points and melting points that differentiate in an amount that makes separating these isomers possible, when generally a *distillation* or *crystallization* is conducted. For instance, cis-IPDA has a boiling point of 253.4 °C, whereas trans-IPDA has a boiling point of 250.7 °C. As such, a difference of 2.7 °C in the boiling points of these two

substances makes it possible to readily *separate* these two substances by a technique such as *distillation*. In addition, it is noted that cis-IPDA has a melting point of 22 °C, whereas trans-IPDA has a melting point of ~34.6 °C. The melting points of cis- and trans-IPDA differentiate even by more than 50°C, which also makes separation clearly possible by one of the described techniques.

Applicant notes that the specification describes several preferred features for distillation. *See, e.g.*, page 5, lines 4 to 9, page 5, line 33 to page 6, line 17, and page 9, lines 24 to 29. However, there is no recitation that these features are *critical* for purification and separation.

In view of the specification and of amended claim 1, Applicant submits that one would clearly understand that crude IPDA can be purified and separated by various techniques, such as distillation or crystallization, in order to obtain a cis/trans-isomer ratio of at least 73/27 in one fraction and another fraction having a cis/trans-isomer ratio of less than 63/37. As such, one would be enabled to practice the claimed invention without any undue experimentation.

Therefore, Applicant believes the rejection is improper. Accordingly withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

The rejection of claims 2-7 and 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is traversed and obviated, in view of the amendment to claim 1, as discussed above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is kindly requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification has been amended, in accordance with the Office's suggestion, to include a Brief Description of the Drawings section. Applicant has further amended the specification to include additional headings and sub-headings, in accordance with standard U.S. patent practice.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is kindly requested.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If any additional amendments are suggested, the Office is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Application No. 10/522,994
Amendment dated April 2, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 10, 2007

Docket No.: 13156-00003-US

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 13156-00003-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Bryant L. Young/
Bryant L. Young
Registration No.: 49,073
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant